

The Carl Beck Papers
in Russian and East
European Studies

No. 505

THE CONTEXT OF THE
MARXIST-LENINIST VIEW
OF SLOVAK LITERATURE
1945-1969

Norma Rudinsky

Center for Russian and East European Studies
University of Pittsburgh

Norma Leigh Rudinsky has an A.B. and an M.A. from Stanford University. She has taught in the English Department at Oregon State University in Corvallis since 1964. She is the translator of *Seven Slovak Stories* by Martin Kukucin (Slovak Institute, Rome/Cleveland) and her new translation, *An Incipient Feminist: Slovak Stories by Timrava from 1896 to 1926*, will be published by Slavica Publishers next year.

August 1986

ISSN 0889-275X

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and less than 70 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4E23 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15260.

INTRODUCTION

135
9/10/56

This paper resulted from an attempt to explore factors determining or underlying the "Marxification" of Slovak literature after 1945-- an attempt motivated by a hunch that certain Marxist-Leninist principles had provided a different insight into Slovak literature from that provided by the liberal, democratic "aesthetic appreciation" school of criticism in prewar Czechoslovakia. The idea that Slovak literary criticism has thrived, relatively, since World War II is by no means new and was advanced, for example, by emigré critics.¹ Previous writers, however, have emphasized political changes that gave the Slovaks room to develop: the Košice program of 1945 with official Czech acceptance of Slovak individuality; great economic investment and related social improvements in Slovakia; exponential growth of the native intelligentsia; the rise to power of Alexander Dubček beginning in 1963, and especially Dubček's international prestige in contrast to previously little-known Slovak leaders; the statute on federalization creating the "Slovak Socialist Republic" in 1969; and the continued power if not prestige of the Slovak president of Czechoslovakia and secretary of the Communist party, Gustav Husák. Without denying the benefit of these actual events, I will stress the previously unnoticed theoretical benefit of Marxism-Leninism for understanding the body of Slovak literature as a whole.

11-14-86 AHC 10/13/86

Obviously there is a difference between the explanatory value of a set of critical concepts and the deliberate policy by a literary critical establishment to use those concepts to enhance the political profile of a literature. It seems clear that both aspects were operative in the period under study, but distinguishing between them in particular cases requires knowledge of the motives of a critic or group of critics as well as detailed reconstruc-

tion of the complex, changing cultural policy of both Czechoslovak and Slovak Communist parties. Although certain information of that type is available or can be inferred, it is not my concern here. Ultimately, Marxist-Leninist concepts were useful and this remains true though their use was occasioned by Soviet tanks in 1945 and again in 1968. Moreover, they were useful not in a vacuum but in the Czechoslovak context where the Slovaks gained some latitude for development at the expense of the unitary theory of "Czechoslovakism" and where, equally important, the same Marxist-Leninist theory offered little new insight into the larger, mature, already well-analyzed body of Czech literature. For the historical reasons sketched below, Slovaks were (and are) undergoing a search for identity both more elementary and more extensive than most nations of that area. Thus they were especially receptive to whatever advantages could be found for their self-identification in the only philosophical framework available to them after World War II. Historical relations to Hungary and to Magyar literary history were also relevant, but apparently they seemed less critical than Czech relations, which were more complex and certainly more immediate in the same political formation. This paper will take up only the Czechoslovak context.

The end point of this examination could be set earlier; i.e. 1963, and thus refer to the rehabilitation process and Slovak Writers' Congress demands for more literary freedom that began a new stage in Slovak Marxism. Yet the clearest expression of the new Slovak insight came only later, and (not really paradoxically) in the same liberal years that saw the beginning of non-Marxist or at least less Marxist theories of literature, reaching back to structuralism, semiotics, and the Prague Circle and reaching east to the Tartu School, as will be mentioned later. In fact, since the Marxist-Leninist view in part

synthesized previous Slovak views on literature, it required the liberal years for its clearest expression, and it was given political approval by the 1969 federalization of Czechoslovakia. Unquestionably the 1939-45 existence of the Slovak Republic (with its greater amount of independence than Slovaks previously experienced but its tarbaby relation to Nazi Germany) had a critical, complex effect on the Slovaks' perception of themselves. But officially this effect has never been admitted in the ritualistic condemnation of the period, and it remains outside the scope of this study.

It goes without saying that I do not doubt the severity of the cultural repression occurring in the same period. For example, poetic losses ranged from the long-unpublished Christian writers Valentín Beniak, Emil Lukáč, and Janko Silan to the long-imprisoned Communist poet Laco Novomeský, and included the surrealist poetry of the 1930s and 1940s (also called *Avant-Garde* and *Modernist*), which was condemned as "personalist" and "elitist" despite its high level of craft and its great beauty. In spite of these losses, some chestnuts were pulled from the fire by literary critics, and their baby need not be thrown out with the bath water. Even for a non-Marxist like myself, the explanation of Slovak history and literature given in the Marxist-Leninist theoretical synthesis represents something of an intellectual achievement under adverse circumstances.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Though this subject is too large for any but outline treatment here, it is much smaller than an outsider would expect-- for two reasons. There are only about five million Slovaks, and both the literature written in Slovak and the standard language are relatively recent, with most existing manu-

scripts dating from only the 16th century.³ Even including the long oral tradition of folklore, the first impression for any student of English literature is of poverty: no *Beowulf*, no Chaucer, no Renaissance tragedy, no metaphysical sonnets, no Restoration comedy of manners. The domination of one dialect over another, which occurred in English with Chaucer in the 14th century, occurred with Slovak only in the 1840s.

Most of the Slavs have had difficult histories, but certain of them were blessed by numbers (the Russians), by early development (the Czechs with the capital of the Holy Roman Empire and with Charles University founded in 1348), or by sea power and independence (the Dalmatians); and some were cursed by invasion and long occupation (the Russians with the Mongols and the South Slavs and the Slovaks with the Turks), by overuse of Latin (the Austro-Hungarian Empire), or by foreign culture (Austria-Hungary again). As one easily sees, the Slovaks had no blessings and all the curses, and they also suffered a unique loss. The single most promising event in early Slavic cultural history occurred in Slovakia and Moravia near the central Danube River, i.e. the use of the Old Slavic tongue as a written language by Cyril and Methodius and its acceptance by Pope Hadrian in A.D. 868 as a liturgical language on a par with Greek, Latin, and Hebrew (the highest mark of culture at the time). But this cultural development was soon stopped by Germanic expansionism and intrigues in the Vatican and among the Slavic princes, the Slavonic liturgy was suppressed in 885, and the Great Moravian Empire was destroyed by the combined forces of the German emperor and the Magyar tribes from Central Asia (symbolically dated by the defeat at Bratislava in 907). The Slavic disciples of Cyril and Methodius were driven south and east to Bulgaria, Serbia, and Kiev, i.e. back to Greek and Byzantine civilization, while in Central Europe

Slavic culture was mixed with Latin and Germanic culture." A comparable situation in British history was the existence of the "Celtic fringe," in which Celtic folklore, traditions, and sense of identity were forced out to Scotland, Wales, and Ireland while the Celts in the center were submerged and overlaid by the official English culture of the political power.

Having been in the center of the Great Moravian Empire, the Slovaks suffered more when it was destroyed than the Czechs, Poles, and South Slavs because they had no other political center; thus they had no economic and legal systems in which to develop their language, and no aristocratic court to foster literature.¹³ Instead, they remained part of the Kingdom of Hungary for a thousand years until the formation of Czechoslovakia in 1918. Written literature in Slovak, therefore began (at least according to known manuscripts) only after the replacement of Latin by vernaculars in the 16th to 18th centuries and with the Herderean "flowering" of Slavic nationalism in the 18th and 19th centuries.

How then do these historical facts relate to Marxian literary criticism? My answer has two parts: first, in relation to literary history, and second, to aesthetic theory.

SLOVAK MARXIST HISTORIOGRAPHY AND LITERARY HISTORIOGRAPHY

In the preparation of Slovak Marxist literary history, at least three difficult problems had to be dealt with. Nothing was published until 1958, except for an effort at a more or less Marxist history by Andrej Mráz.¹⁴

First, literary historians attempted to build upon the numerically slight but historically genuine Slovak tradition of proletarian literature and Marx-

ist literary criticism centered in the *DAV* movement and its journal founded in 1924 by Daniel Okáli, Andrej Siracký, and Vladimír Clementis, in which the poet Laco Novomeský also played a leading role. The word *dav* means "masses," but is also an acronym for the first names of the founders. Despite its many Czech connections, especially Peter Jilemnický, Edo Urx, and Klement Gottwald himself, the *davists* represented a genuinely Slovak movement that demanded Slovak rights during the first Czechoslovak Republic and in the 1945 Košice program which defined the Slovaks as a separate nation. The *davists* also played a strong cultural role in the immediate postwar period; e.g. Novomeský was president of the *Matica slovenská* in 1945. However, the continuity of this native movement was destroyed from 1950 on by the trials of these same Communists as "bourgeois nationalists," the hanging of Clementis, and the long imprisonment of Novomeský and Okáli along with Gustav Husák."

Their rehabilitation in 1963 became less of a return to international proletarianism than a call to "Slovakification" against Antonín Novotný's centralism. This fact had consequences. As Galia Golan has written:

It was the Slovaks who formed the spearhead of the de-Stalinization movement, mainly because of the desire of Slovak communists to undo the injustices inflicted on their party in the Stalinist era The admission of 'Stalinist' errors with regard to the past injustices led to a reappraisal of such national phenomena as the 1944 Slovak National Uprising, and with the belated justification of such events as this and of their perpetrators, certain old Slovak nationalist ideas seemed also to be rehabilitated. In fact the purges and rehabilitation seemed to act as a spur to Slovak

nationalism, which increased with the progress of de-Stalinization.⁶⁹

Thus, even Khrushchev attended the large celebration of the Slovak National Uprising in 1964. The "Slovak party could admit to nationalism without the 'bourgeois' label"⁷⁰

These rehabilitations, in fact, stimulated a very interesting ideological debate about nationalism and Marxism, especially in 1965 with the celebration of the 150-year anniversary of the birth of L'udovít Štúr-- whom Karl Marx had explicitly condemned for not joining the Magyar revolution of 1848 against Austria. Of the various efforts to explain away Marx's objections, the most effective were probably those of Gustav Husák, who said Marx could not have known the historical specifics of Slovak-Magyar relations in the Austro-Hungarian Empire-- where nationalism had been "a progressive, not a conservative force, a revolutionary program which sought revolutionary solutions to the political and social problems of the people within a national framework, against the conservative forces of society, feudalism and oppression of smaller nations."⁷¹ Two years later Husák used Lenin's principle of the "democratic right of every nation to occupy a position of equality with all the other nations" against the previous economic view that industrialization and consequent social changes of Slovakia would eliminate nationalism. Instead, he said, the dialectics of social change required constitutional provisions ensuring equality of all nations, i.e. the federalization that in fact occurred in late 1968.⁷²

Through the 50s and 60s while the battles over Slovak national status were being fought, two historical problems also had to be confronted. Since Slovaks had undergone little political development for the reasons already sketched, their sense of self had become tied to language and therefore also to

literature. This fact brought general history and literary history especially close together, and historical questions about Slovak identity had to be settled before literary history could be written. Thus, the "Marxification" of national history preceded or accompanied the Marxification of literary history. As an illustration, the following two quotations about the advantage of Marxist historical analysis for Slovak national historiography parallel my thesis on literary advantages. In the preface to a standard history, Ján Tibenský says:

The chief contribution of our work is ... to apply more explicitly than before the combination of the ethnic principle-- history of the Slovak people-- with the territorial principle-- history of Slovakia, a land where other peoples also lived and still live: Magyars, Germans, Ukrainians. Naturally it was more difficult to apply the territorial principle before 1918, and in the following period everything hung upon a narrow nationalism, on the one hand, and on the other hand, upon the backwardness of Slovak historical science Today, however, ... Slovak history appears in a new light Archeologists have shown the continuity of ancient settlements from their dawn to the arrival of the Slavs as well as showing the influence of earlier cultures, especially Celtic and Roman, on Slavic-Slovak culture. Moreover, from their arrival to the present, the Slovaks have always had numerical superiority over other nationalities inhabiting this land, and (despite their political disadvantage in Hungary) they have peacefully assimilated smaller groups and impressed their own character upon the land they inhabited. These facts

allow us to objectively consider the history of Slovakia as Slovak history without ignoring the territorial principle or neglecting the share of other nationalities in the history of our homeland.

We consider the common people [l'ud] as the chief subject of Slovak history because the people are the foundation of the civilization process, the creators of material and spiritual value. Therefore, in contrast to earlier syntheses, we have placed a much greater emphasis on economic and social history and on class conflicts as the chief motor of the unceasing process of democratization. In this way, we were able to eliminate several internal inconsistencies of the earlier conception of Slovak history, ... which considered its subject to be only the politically conscious nation It is against the background of internal economic development and social change that we were able to concentrate on the first centuries of feudalism and systematically follow the origin and formation of Slovak nationality and its gradual birth into a modern nation as a natural, ordered process having centuries-old roots in Slovak soil and with all the historical contingencies of time and place.¹²

A popular summary of Slovak historiography expresses the point more baldly:

Slovaks did not have their own political history (not even such as Transylvania and Croatia had); the Slovak past had become so mixed with the Hungarian [Uhorské] past that both had been wound into one skein....

This provided the argument to deny the Slovaks their past and thus their right to be counted as a modern nation. That period has fortunately passed away, but Slovak history is still no simple matter today. The baroque historians first began to unwind the Hungarian skein, but they did not untangle it. The same is true of the romantic historians of the 19th century, and even of the new scientifically based specialists of the first half of our century. None of them could untangle Slovak history. For that a new historical method was necessary, historical materialism, which was so essential for the Slovaks that they would have had to invent it themselves if Marx had not.¹³

The Marxist emphasis on "everyday" history of the common people who did the work eventually helped in the discovery of a fairly strong revolutionary tradition among peasants and workers. This had been scarcely noted in previous histories, except with the semi-legendary Juraj Jánošík, who had been treated primarily as a national symbol, not a class figure. This "Slovak revolutionary tradition" is seen in the miners' rebellions and strikes of 1410, 1525-26, 1608-10, 1704, etc.; mass flights of serfs from their masters; repeated peasants' charges of ill treatment; and various socialist activities in the 19th and 20th centuries. While the Marxists may over-emphasize such data, previously they had been ignored.¹⁴ Here, moreover, we come to one of those places where the Czechoslovak context is crucial. In contrast to the newly emphasized Slovak revolutionary tradition, the famous Bohemian kings could be considered feudal tyrants with Czech pride in them condemned as reactionary and "bourgeois." This was a vulgar self-defense mechanism (and unfair to tragic losses in Czech history from the murdered Václav through Jan Hus and

White Mountain to Munich), but it combatted the equally vulgar vanity over the Hegelian "historicity" of the old Kingdom of Bohemia as shown by Václav Chaloupecký and others in the first republic. In the previous Hegelianism there had been elements of the "blame the victim" syndrome from which Slovaks were trying to escape. In fact, such condemnation of the feudal aristocracy and the bourgeoisie really continued previous Slovak protests on non-Marxist moral and national grounds, but now there was the new element of Marxist Czech historians supporting the Marxist Slovak history-- a helpful change.

The second historical problem was one that had been central in the first republic. The ethnic and territorial principles referred to by Tibenský were difficult to apply to Slovak history for another reason besides the lack of political independence in the territory inhabited by Slovaks: that is, the lack of a single literary language before the time of Bernolák and Štúr (1780-1840). By analogy to the long use of Latin as the cultural and literary language of all Europe, Eugen Pauliny and other linguists developed the dual-language theory, which explains why medieval Slovaks began using and adapting the neighboring, similar, and readily available Czech language for their vernacular instead of developing pure Slovak (as would have been natural for the ethnic collective of Slovaks). Simply put, the political and economic position of Slovaks did not allow for the growth of their own language, while the dominant position of Charles University and its many students (along with other factors) aided the choice of the well-developed Czech language. This theory was by no means dependent upon Marxist philosophy and was in fact advanced by L'udovít Novák in 1938.¹⁵ But it was further developed and officially accepted in conjunction with the historically Marxist perception that language establishment depends upon economic power centers (not *vice versa*, as German roman-

tics and the earlier Slovak and Czech nationalists tended to believe).¹⁶ The dual-language theory and the territorial principle referred to by Tibenský thus allowed Slovak literary historians, for example, to consider the Czech-language literature of the Protestants (and many Catholics outside the circles using Western Slovak or *berňoláčtina*) as part of Slovak literary history, while still agreeing that it was also part of Czech literary history on the language principle. This resolution made irrelevant (from a literary viewpoint though not a linguistic one) the sometimes difficult decision whether a piece of transitional literature was written in "*bohemi-zovaná slovenčina*" or "*slovákizovaná čeština*,"¹⁷ and thus it defused the heated language controversy.

SLOVAK MARXIAN LITERARY THEORY

With this very general view of Slovak history, we can turn to my second point, the literary theory that was simultaneously being developed through application of Soviet literary principles. Here we find a fundamental theoretical difference from prewar aesthetics. Traditional aesthetics, "the theory of beauty in art," inevitably views a loss such as the disappearance of Great Moravia and the resultant millenium of stunted cultural growth as a critical defect. Marxian aesthetics does not. Simply put, such a defect is minimized instead of maximized where all intellectual and cultural history is viewed as the reflection of economic forces acting within social classes and cutting across national lines. This somewhat crass formulation does not do justice to Marx's own views, of course, but it is not terribly far from the official view in the late 1940s and 1950s. Unfortunately, the Marxian view of literary history that predominated in Slovakia was much closer to the social determinism of Plekhanov than to the

historicist and humanist views of György Lukács (not to mention recent western Marxists), and it often moved to the Zhdanovist extreme (therefore I call it Marxian, not Marxist).

This sociological view was certainly far from Marx's view of literature, as indicated for example in his oft-noted references in the *Grundrisse* to the "unequal relation between the development of material production and art" and to "certain periods of the highest development of art [which] stand in no direct connection to the general development of society, or to the material basis and skeleton structure of its organization." This is taken to mean that great literature reveals not just the social and material realities of a period but also its collective consciousness while becoming what Marx calls a "source of esthetic enjoyment" that prevails "as the standard and model."¹⁸ However, even a humanist application of the determinist theory of historical materialism makes modest claims for literature when contrasted to the traditional theory of art, taken here loosely as made of three strands: the Aristotelian and Sidneyan tradition of mimesis or representation of metaphysically real universals in concrete images; the Arnoldian tradition of art as the passing of "high culture" from one generation to another; and doctrines of aesthetic form including the romantic tradition of artist as superman and liberated soul, the extreme of art for art's sake, and new criticism.¹⁹

This contrast shows the first and most essential benefit to Slovak literature. The Marxian definition of literature as only part of the superstructure logically and inevitably has a levelling and relativizing effect compared to the concept of art as the highest human activity, the reflection of man's deepest and most complex universal nature. The degree of levelling ranges from extreme in a primitive like Zhdanov to imperceptible in a cultivated sophisti-

cated Marxist critic like Lukács, but the potential always remains and was generally actualized in East European criticism on the sociological pattern. From this perspective, the gaps and lacunae in Slovak literature are seen as results of the feudal mode of production and its derivative political and juridical systems that oppressed the Slovaks; therefore they seem less important than in the liberal aesthetic view where such phenomena must be seen as failures in the humane attempt at aesthetic excellence.

This psychological effect of relativizing literature was increased because Slovak literature has few of the literary forms that are lowered and more of those that are raised in the levelling process. That is, traditional forms such as classical and renaissance tragedy, epic poetry, the sonnet, odes (which usually represent the literary peak in the Aristotelian tradition or the "high" culture of Matthew Arnold) are exactly the same forms which could not develop in the Slovak language for the reasons mentioned above. Conversely, many of the "popular" forms that gain status under Marxism are most prominent in Slovak literature, i.e. folk tales and ballads reflecting feudal economic and political relations (social forces affecting marriage, warriors' laments, etc.). Even the simplest proverbs and folk weather forecasts acquired new significance as human response to the means of production. To some extent, this is a general phenomenon of the 20th century resulting from the growth of anthropology and cultural linguistics as sciences and from the new appreciation of primitive and naive art. Moreover, the Slovak *ľud* or "folk" had long been considered the main carrier of the national tradition in the absence of a strong nobility or even gentry, and folk literature had long been considered central in Slovak literature, e.g. by Ján Kollár and Ľudovít Štúr. In the first republic, there had also been the beginning of a structuralist/semiotic view of Slovak literature in

Prague Linguistic Circle studies of folk art by Petr Bogatyrev and the first Slovak students such as Andrej Melicherčík. But this very promising effort could not continue in its own right.³⁰

In the new political context, Marxian literary analysis sharpened and legitimized the previous nationalist and structuralist emphasis on folk art. The introduction to the first volume of the "academic" literary history of Ján Mišianik says, "Folk literature ... could alone best fill the national function because it best expressed the interests of the people," and it "imposed upon the written Slovak literature its own attitude toward reality".³¹ The ideological weight of this term *folk* is explained well by Milada Součková, using the Czech form *lid*:

lid designates more than the passive recipients of a literary work, more than a mass composed of potential anonymous readers. The *lid* might accept or reject the literary work; it is a proteus that inspires the writer, yet might also appear as his judge. Literature has its very roots in the 'people,' and it is the 'people's creativity' which is its ever-driving force, the individual author being an accidental executor. It is also suggested that any exclusion of the people's participation in literary affairs automatically causes a loss of value.³²

The psychological tendency to denigrate the literary forms that occurred in the feudal and bourgeois periods was made explicit, of course, by Maxim Gorky, especially after the early 1930s, and his influence became great in official critical theory in postwar Czechoslovakia.³³ Even Lukács, though himself developing Marxian literary theory in a more sophisticated way, praised Gorky's effect:

[Gorky] always brought the problem of the popular element in literature into close relation with the heritage of the past. For only if the popular element in poetry is made the focal point of all historical and aesthetic considerations of literature, can the real historical roots of the latter be traced. [Gorky] himself had very decided views on this point. He said . . . : 'There is every reason to hope that when Marxists will have written a history of culture, we shall see that the part played by the *bourgeoisie* in the creation of culture has been greatly overestimated, especially in the sphere of literature.'

Thus the Marxian tradition claimed to give and could be used to attribute greater worth and dignity to Slovak folk literature than traditional aesthetics had done.

Gorky was also responsible for much of the Marxian theory of literary realism, and his emphasis upon realism was especially beneficial to Slovak literary criticisms because its first full development coincided with the 19th and 20th century periods of romanticism and realism (which Gorky placed almost together). In fact, the first well-known writers were all realists: the poet Pavol Országh-Hviezdoslav and the novelists Svetozár Hurban-Vajanský and Martin Kukučín. For a second reason this realistic period of Slovak literature is especially suitable to a positive Marxian analysis: it pictured the development of capitalism from the point of view of the "downtrodden masses." In Slovakia the masses were not proletarian, since industrialization had only begun, but at least they were impoverished and alienated. This subject matter of oppression allowed the praise, for example, of the otherwise romantic and

idealist (in the Marxist sense) poet Andrej Braxatoris-Sládkovič.²⁶

Not only was the subject matter suitable, but also the Slovak writers' social origins were particularly appropriate for Marxist literary criticism. Whenever the first step in Marxist literary criticism was performed, which Lukács called "examining carefully the real social foundations on which ... [the author's] existence rested and the real social forces under the influence of which the human and the literary personality of this author developed,"²⁷ it was never the ruling class that appeared. Any Slovak who achieved much of a political position had also switched his language to Magyar or German. This fact probably helped to foster the further debasement of "sociological criticism" into mere labelling of writers as good or bad according to their social or political position, which was again part of the influence of Plekhanov and Gorky. In a 1957 essay on the periodization of early Slovak literature, Ján Mišianik argued against the formalist/structuralist periodization made by Mikulíš Bakoš in 1944, and insisted that the central issue in distinguishing literary periods was the "conscious social position" and the "tendency of social development in the literary process," since formal or aesthetic elements alone distort the picture. More than a decade was needed for a grudging admission that the reverse is also true.²⁸

Once the social foundations of a writer or a literary period had been examined, moreover, the evaluation of subject matter could be made especially favorable to Slovak writers through two other Marxian critical concepts: first, "partisanship" or "tendency," and second, "objective progressiveness," i.e. the correctness of those writers or schools that in fact "played a positive role" in the downfall of feudalism or capitalism though they personally lacked consciousness of what they were doing. By these two

concepts writers could be praised for historical significance without regard for aesthetic quality. Ready examples are the Protestant diary and documentary writers describing their persecution during the Counter-Reformation; the Franciscan social satirist and moralist Hugolín Gavlovič with his *Valaská škola* of 1755; and Juraj Fándly with his satiric dialogue *Duverna zmluva medzi mnichom a diablom* of 1789. Conversely, these same two Marxian concepts allowed the denigration of earlier kinds of literature, not represented in Slovak literature, as "objectively reactionary," though their authors were subjectively sincere and humanitarian (including medieval and renaissance religious works). Such denigration thus supported the levelling effect cited above as resulting from the Marxian concept of literature as only part of the superstructure.

Equally important to the argument for the theoretical advantages given to Slovak literature by Marxian literary criticism is the fact that the process of relativization and levelling also worked to the disadvantage of Czech literature. As a loose summary, one can say that from the middle ages on, much of the "high" literature absent in the Slovak language was present in Czech, and, conversely, Bohemian folk art almost disappeared as urban culture developed. Thus, certain major Czech literary traditions could be praised (and were) as "objectively progressive" (e.g. the sermons and Biblical translations of Jan Hus and the writings of the Moravian Brotherhood, including Comenius). Nevertheless, much of the earliest Czech literature (e.g. medieval religious lyrics or court epics) was denigrated when it was no longer considered in terms of "high" culture and aesthetic quality but instead treated as the mystification of feudal economic relations.³⁷ In general, the Soviet aesthetics being applied in Czechoslovakia (especially the didactic, reductionist trend) had developed from and reflected Russian so-

cial and economic traditions which were more similar to those in Slovakia than in the more industrialized, urban Bohemia. Thus the distortion was greater when that aesthetics was applied to Czech literature. This situation influenced Slovak literary criticism to an unusual degree, since Czech literature had earlier formed almost the only standard of comparison (for example, in both Jaroslav Vlček's and Štefan Krčméry's histories, not to mention those of Albert Pražák). This happened in part because the former unitary concept of a Czechoslovak language and literature had tended, even unconsciously, to make Slovak studies derivative and dependent upon Czech models.³⁰ Although the Kosiče program of 1945 officially replaced the unitary model of the first Republic, it remained difficult to work out a new relationship, and in this competitive situation, ironically and sadly, any Czech loss could be thought to represent a possible Slovak gain, and any Slovak gain could seem a Czech loss.³¹

Another Soviet literary concept that helped Slovak literature was the Leninist idea of national literatures. Before and during World War II, the major alternative to the Herbartian aestheticist view of literature had been the national view, by which Slovak literature gained at least the dignity of being considered the natural expression of a unique nation-- "A poor thing maybe but my own." This national view had come from the romanticism of Ján Kollár and Jozef Šafárik (though they did not themselves want the Slovaks to stand along linguistically) and had grown through the Štúr movement, the *Matica slovenská* movement, the National Party, the People's Party, etc., where it was usually based on the concept of natural law and kept the distinctively Christian relation it had had earlier.³²

After World War II the national view of literature was not available in the same form, as it had been condemned with the so-called "clericofascist"

regime of the Slovak Republic. For anyone who missed that lesson, there were soon the trials of the Slovak Communists as "bourgeois nationalists." However, along with Lenin's nationality policy, used in the Slovak drive for federalization (as noted above), a new definition of national literature was available in Leninist terms which had been used to explain the literary mosaic of the multi-national Soviet Union: a true national literature was considered to express a particular causality of the socioeconomic base reflected in a specific national consciousness.³³ Each national literature was said to be a valuable contribution to world culture:

Universal artistic culture is replenished by the works of all peoples, big and small. It does not reject specific national peculiarities in modern conditions, but positively presupposes them and absorbs all the best created by each nation and nationality. At the same time it is precisely because works of this kind transcend narrow national bounds and attain world-wide significance that they are entitled to the name of universal. They always remain national in their affiliations and in their sources.³⁴

In this way critical results could be the same although the basic ideology was different.

A summarizing poetic image of the Slovak sense of self was given by the establishment novelist Vladimír Mináč in his highly praised essay *Dúchanie do pahrieb*:

In the conventional sense of historiography, we were the object instead of the subject of history, the place where history occurred. And since this so-called history occurred by means of wars, pillage, marauding, and re-

pression, we were the object of wars, pillage, marauding, and repression [94] The common people fell like flies, but they always got up again and built new houses, new villages, a new countryside The persistence, constancy, naturalness, and omnipresence of this force-- that is our fundamental answer to our fundamental question. That is the poetry, if you like, of our history. From blood and sweat, from pain and work, was born the civilization of this piece of the earth. We couldn't always stand without falling; but we always stood back up again. Others could build cathedrals and castles: we had had to rebuild our hovels over and over again. We were the border guards of a whole civilization. We were the *Chodovia* of Europe.³⁵ We stopped the Mongols and the Turks and other Asiatics, not by our swords and our heroic deeds but by outlasting them [96].... I know that our contribution to world history is modest. But if the history of civilization is ever measured by justice, which means by the work put into it, then we don't need to worry: we did more than our share [98].³⁶

Written in 1969 near the end of the liberal period, Mináč's essay is in effect a summary of this Slovak intellectual trend. Besides its humanist Marxism, the essay echoes in various places the specifically Slovak panslav, even slavophil-like, tradition with its anti-capitalist feeling which long preceded Slovak Marxism, and which has been found by all critics, for example, in such a Christian writer as Martin Kukučín.³⁷ One also feels here another pre-Marxist comparison: besides the Worker of the World,

Mináč is writing about the Slovaks as the Salt of the Earth, Everyman, the Common Man archetype.³⁸

Analysis of the literature resulting from this tradition belongs to a separate study, but a few brief examples may be given. There is a certain continuity of the equation of work and goodness in the social satire and exhortation mixed with theological poetry in *Valaská škola* (The Shepherd's School) by the Franciscan Hugolín Gavlovič (1755); the retribution against the lovers of mammon in Martin Kukučín's *Dies irae*; (1893); the destruction and exploitation of the cannon-fodder youth shown in *Hrdinovia* (Great War Heroes) by Timrava (1918); the village revolt against the local symbols of oppression and corruption in *Živý bič* (The Living Scourge) by Milo Urban (1927); and the dumb, unacknowledged, aborted revolts of the characters in *Jozef Mak* by J. C. Hronský (1933).³⁹ A contemporary example is the recent novel and film *Tisícročná včela* with its central imagery of the millennial queen bee, the life of work and love, of labor and sex by an ordinary family of carpenters.⁴⁰ These are all works with nonpolitical, nonintellectualized, populist, worker-of-the-world, salt-of-the-earth archetypes that fit the Slovak experience.

CONCLUSION

Overuse of the class archetype of the Slovak *ľud*, however, eventually made it a stereotype which disgusted most writers and cultural critics; in fact, the 1960s reaction against sociological criticism and socialist realism was very antagonistic to this stereotype *ľud* and the related stereotypes of the partisan and the worker. The period of the late 1960s brought wider experimentation in literary genres and themes and, for the first time, truly analytic techniques in literary criticism, thereby in a sense

bringing to an end the period of Marxification of Slovak literature.⁴¹ The third volume of the "academic" history of Slovak literature (published in 1965) shows an effort to resolve "the causes and effects of the period of the personality cult and the dogmatic simplification of Marxism-Leninism" (III, 5) as well as to avoid "simplistic sociologizing and disregard for the specificity of art" (III, 13). In particular, at least token approval was finally given to the formalist and structuralist work of Mikuláš Bakoš (III, 9).⁴²

Thus, what I have called the special insights of Marxist-Leninist theory carried only so far. The explanatory value of Marxist historical analysis was needed to treat past Slovak culture when the language was not developed and literature was nearly impossible for political and economic reasons as well as linguistic ones. But contemporary Slovak literature is now in the same position (and has the same relation to Marxism-Leninism) as contemporary Czech or Magyar literature. Ironically, this change came while new textual, linguistic, and historical studies were considerably enlarging the body of Slovak literature, not only as literature in Slovakia but as works in the Slovak language or in mixed Czech and Slovak. For example, eight renaissance love poems were found in a Vienna archive in 1958, and a manuscript of Peter Benický's Slovak poems of 1652 was recovered only in 1985. Of course, some of the new finds and new claims for old texts are still problematic, but there is a genuine gain and the levelling effect of Marxist aesthetics is less important now than when it was first felt.

For a Western student used to nation-states with only minor (or ignored) language problems such as in Belgium or Brittany, and even for a Slavic student concerned only with Russia and Poland, the case of Slovakia is first frustrating, then surprising, and finally intriguing. As Peter Brock says, Slovak

self-understanding is based on the concept of "the cultural-linguistic nation," not the political-state nation.⁴³ Yet this is not the whole story because ethnic Slovaks did not form a unified literary language group, and their self-awareness and self-definition have complex and heterogeneous elements, ranging from their long use of generic names for themselves such as *slovan* or *sloven* to the fact that major adherents of extreme Slovak/Czech interdependence leading almost to assimilation (such as Šafárik and Kollár and later Vavro Šrobár) were themselves Slovak.

Thus it is no wonder that non-Slovaks had trouble understanding these people and have usually accepted versions given by neighbors, whether Magyar, German, or Czech. Slovak intellectual history can most easily be described by the clichés *quest for identity* and *self-exploration*. Slovak historiography, including literary historiography, had to ask first, not "What have we done?" but "Why do we and our literature still exist against the odds?" There is really no paradox in this drive to self-exploration, bringing partial acceptance of Marxism-Leninism, despite the basic conflict between its atheist, internationalist orientation and the generally religious, conservative, provincial society that Slovakia still was in 1948. It is no more a paradox than with the liberation ideology of Catholic Latin America. The Marxists analyzed economic structural barriers in the way of Slovak self-knowledge that had not been previously identified in the "bourgeois" republic. The Slovak drive to autonomy has been "unrelenting" as Dorothea El Mallakh says,⁴⁴ but it has also been ingenious and flexible, and Marxism was in some ways a serendipitous instrument in this drive. As Václav Havel says, "The mystery of culture's future is a reflection of the very mystery of the human spirit."⁴⁵

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

For their critical reviews I thank Michael Sprinker, Frantisek Galan, Robert Wess, John Biggart, and Gerald J. Sabo, whose stimulating disagreements (with various versions of this paper and with each other) helped very much to develop and clarify these arguments. Although the subject of this paper was not part of my project on two IREX grants in Bratislava in 1982 and 1984, inevitably the Slovak problematic was clarified on these IREX-supported stays, for which I am grateful.

NOTES

1. See especially J. M. Kirschbaum, *Slovak Language and Literature* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1975) 41-50 and *passim*. Kirschbaum's earliest such statement is in "Etnická a jazyková samobytnosť Slovákov v tézach súčasných literátov na Slovensku," *Most*, 7 (1960), 60-70, especially 60-61.
2. This poetic group has been analyzed in English by Peter Petro, "Slovak Surrealist Poetry: The Movement and Its Rediscovery," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, XX (June 1978), 237-244.
3. For summaries in English see Robert Auty, "Dialect, Koine, and Tradition in the Formation of Literary Slovak," *Slavonic and East European Review* (London), XXXIX (1961), 339-345; and L'ubomír Durovič, "Slovak," in *The Slavic Literary Languages*, eds., Alexander M. Schenker and Edward Stankiewicz (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies, 1980), 211-228. The standard Slovak source is Eugen Pauliny, *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny* (Bratislava, 1966; Reprint, Bratislava: Slovenske pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1971). Much less is available on Slovak literature. The best short description in English is by Karol Strmen in *An Anthology of Slovak Literature*, comp. Andrew Cincura (Riverside: University Hardcovers, 1976), xix-liv; a longer treatment is in Kirschbaum, *Slovak Language*, and Július Noge, *An Outline of Slovakian Litera-*

ture (Bratislava: Tatrapress, 1968). I here refer to literature in the Slovak language, not literature by Slovaks or works written in Slovakia, which would include many works in Latin, Czech and Magyar; this point is taken up later.

4. The Slovak (and Czech) view of the Great Moravian Empire is given in the Slovak histories cited below; for a summary in English see Ján Dekan, *Moravia Magna*, trans. H. Trebatická (Bratislava: Tatran, 1980), and Michal Lacko, "The Popes and Great Moravia in the Light of Roman Documents," *Slovak Studies*, XII (1972, actually printed 1974), 9-133. The Great Moravian tradition lasted longer in Bohemia than in Moravia and Slovakia; it was revived somewhat by Karel IV in Prague in the 14th century, but it could not survive against Latin and German pressure.

5. In an analogy to this Slovak situation, the English Marxist critic Terry Eagleton has contrasted the development of English literature in a national language through the political and cultural power of London and Oxbridge, to the opposite situation in Ireland where Gaelic was lost as a national language and almost as a folk language through the lack of an Irish political and cultural center, in *Criticism and Ideology* (London: NLB, 1976), 55-56.

6. Mráz's *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava: SAVU, 1948) was a rewrite of his *Literatur der Slowaken* (1943). It was followed by a one-volume *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry* in 1960, edited by Milan Pisut and enlarged in 1962 (Bratislava: Osveta, 1960 and 1962), and especially by the five-volume "academic" history, *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava: SAV, 1958-85), hereafter *Dejiny SAV*.

7. For a summary of this break, see Štefan Drug, *DAV a davisti* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1965) and *Vladimír Clementis* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1967).

8. Galia Golan, *The Czechoslovak Reform Movement* (Cambridge University Press, 1971), 189.

9. *Ibid.*, 195.

10. Husák's arguments (and other's) were published in the liberal weekly *Kultúrny život* in October, 1965 For a summary, see Golan, 196-98.

11. A major symposium on Czech-Slovak relations sponsored by the Slovak Academy of Sciences was published in *Historický časopis*, XV (1967). Husák's arguments are on 568-72. For a summary see Golan, 200-02.

12. Ján Tibenský, *Slovensko: Dejiny* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1971), 7-8. This formulation from the preface dated 26 March 1969 is a clear summary of the general position that developed from *Tézy k slovenským dejinám* (Bratislava: SAV, 1955), subsequent histories, and Slovak parts of Czechoslovak histories.

13. Pavel Dvořák, "Sú Slováci historickým národom?" *Nové slovo* (Bratislava), 16 July 1981, 8. The defensiveness apparent here as well as in Tibenský was a reaction to such Magyar fiction as the "white horse" legend but especially to the perceived tendency of Czech historians in the first republic as summarized by Tibenský in the history itself: "The most aggressive Czech hegemonists, for example from the ranks of the Czech professors at Bratislava University, openly proclaimed a position advocating assimilation of the Slovaks in the interest of 'higher culture'" (666). Tibenský is thinking primarily of Václav Chaloupecký, whose *Staré slovensko* (Bratislava, 1923) showed most of Slovakia as unpopulated and therefore "unhistoric" until the late middle ages. Dvořák has made an interesting popular summary of this controversy and the condemnation of Chaloupecký's thesis by Daniel Rapant in relation to Slovak Marxist historiography, see *Odkryté dejiny: Staré Slovensko* (Bratislava: Pravda, 1975), 133-177. Czech adherence to the Hegelian theory of the superiority of "historic" peoples that had achieved statehood, with the constant use of "historic lands" as a title for the former kingdom of Bohemia and Moravia, was an irritant to the "unhistoric" Slovaks in the first republic, and was obviously still felt in the 1970s and 1980s.

14. In a recent series of vignettes on seventy-one Slovak historical figures, Anthony X. Sutherland concluded that

"Slovaks were without a real, strong revolutionary tradition. Slovak leaders chose to wage their struggle not with the sword but with the pen," in "The Fathers of the Slovak Nation," *Slovak Studies*, XXI (1981), 180. But Sutherland is deliberately writing a Carlylean history as "the chronicle of famous people" (5), and his evidence does not invalidate the Marxist emphasis upon revolutionary activity by the common people. See for example Peter Ratkoš, *Povstanie baníkov na Slovensku 1525-1526* (Bratislava: SAV, 1963).

15. Ľudovít Novák, "Čeština na Slovensku a vznik spisovnej slovenčiny," *Slovenské pohľady*, 54 (1938).

16. Eugen Pauliny, "Kultúrno-historické podmienky a spoločenské funkcie bilingvizmu v dejinách spisovnej slovenčiny," *Československé prednášky pro IV mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Moskvě* (Prague: ČSAV, 1958), 37-45, and Pauliny, *Dejiny spisovnej slovenčiny*; see also Ján Mišianik, *Antológia staršej slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava: SAV, 1964), 16-18. In English, see Auty, *SSEER*; Kirschbaum, *Slovak Language*, 14-15, 89-103; and Durovic, *Slavic Languages*. The emotional context preceding this theory is important. The linguist Ľudovít Novák spoke in a lecture for Slovaks of the "feeling of national inferiority" at the Slovaks' "perceived inadequacy to form an early independent Slovak language," as experienced by himself and other young Slovak linguists in the first republic-- printed in "Čeština na Slovensku v predspisovnom období," *Studia Academica Slovaca*: 11 (Bratislava: Alfa, 1982), 384. Zdenek Salzman emphasizes the estranging effect of statements especially by Milos Weingart asserting the greater cultural and linguistic worth of the Czech language, in "Language Standardization in a Bilingual State: The Case of Czech and Slovak, Two Closely Cognate Languages," *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 4 (Spring 1980), 42-46.

17. Mišianik says there was scarcely an example of pure Czech or pure Slovak (unmixed with dialectal elements) until the late 18th century, *Antológia*, 45.

18. Karl Marx, *The Grundrisse*, ed., and trans. David McLellan (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 46. See Eagleton, *Criticism*, 179-184; also Peter Demetz, *Marx, Engels, and*

the Poets (University of Chicago Press, 1967), 68-71; and George Bizstray, *Marxist Models of Literary Realism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 21.

19. Western critics from the aesthetic tradition object, of course, to lumping them all together as "idealisms," though it is standard for Marxist criticism, and not only in so-called "vulgar Marxism": see for example Eagleton's contrast to the aesthetic view of English literature in Chapter 4, "Ideology and Literary Form," *Criticism*, and his analysis of form and content in *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (University of California Press, 1976), *passim*. The idealist aesthetic tradition in central Europe may be said to have been especially strong, and it is probably no accident that a leading American advocate of the transcendent place of literature and literary criticism is the Vienna-born, Prague-educated René Wellek. An English summary of the formalist tradition in Bohemia is by Peter Steiner, "The Roots of Structuralist Esthetics," in *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929-1946*, ed., Peter Steiner (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), 174-219.

20. Petr Bogatyrev, *Funkcie kroje na Moravskom slovacku* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1937); *Lidové divadlo česke a slovenské* (Praha: F. Borovy, 1940); and, in English, Petr Bogatyrev and Roman Jakobson, "Folklore as a Special Form of Creativity," in *The Prague School*, ed Peter Steiner (Austin: University of Texas, 1982), 32-46. See also Anton Popovic, ed., *Structuralismus v slovenskej vede* (Martin: Matica slovenska, 1970). For a sense of the unfilled potential of this whole movement, see F. W. Galan, *Historic Structures: The Prague School Project 1928-1947* (Austin: University of Texas, 1985). It is, of course, significant that Andrej Melicherčík continued through the 1940s and 1950s as a folklorist while Mikuláš Bakoš did not continue as an analyst of verse structure until late into the 1960s when a third edition of his book *Vývin slovenského verša od školy Štúrovej* was published. Melicherčík's difference in emphasis as he became a Marxist instead of a structuralist is suggested by two of his titles: *Teória národopisu* in 1945 and *Juraj Jánošík-- hrdina protifeudálneho odboja slovenského ľudu* in 1956. It is an irony that this glorification of folklore occurred in the same period of forced

collectivization and massive industrialization which almost eliminated the culture supporting this folklore; as Frantisek Galan has pointed out to me, this irony is central in Milan Kundera's *The Joke*.

21. *Dejiny SAV*, I, 39.

22. Milada Součková, *A Literary Satellite: Czechoslovak-Russian Literary Relations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 46-47. In fact, until the 19th century with its increasingly effective Magyarization, there were a considerable number of Slovak gentry and minor nobility, e.g. Bernolák himself. But this fact was not emphasized by any of the adherents of the Slovak *Ľud* from the Štúrists through the Hlinka party to the Leninists. With the latter, at least, neglect of the gentry was related to the "battle of the baroque," or the opaque question whether baroque literature should be dismissed for its purely religious, especially Counter-Reformation, content. In justice, it should also be said that Mišianik was influential in downing this view; cf. his "Slovenská baroková lyrika," and the afterword by Karol Rosenbaum in *Pohl'ady do staršej slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava: Veda, 1974).

23. Soňa Lesnáková, *Maxim Gorkij v slovenskej kultúre* (Bratislava: SAV, 1961).

24. György Lukács, *Studies in European Realism*, trans. Edith Bone (London: Hillway Publishing Co., 1950), 269.

25. Maxim Gorky, *On Literature* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Pub. House, 1960). The extent to which Gorky blended these two, and when, is a matter of dispute (see Bisztray, *Models of Realism*, 76-77), but the trend of "revolutionary romanticism" is clear in socialist realism; see also Irvin Weil, *Gorky* (New York: Random House, 1966), 125-127. This view of realism is disparaged as the "cult of panrealism [where] all good writers were realists and the development of particular arts was taken only as the conflict of realism with antirealism," *Dejiny SAV*, III, 7.

26. This was especially true of *Detvan* (1853), e.g. in *Poézia štúrovcov*, ed. Victor Kochol (Bratislava: SAV, 1955), 86-202.

27. Lukács, *European Realism*, 16.

28. Mišianik's essay was also published in *Dejiny SAV*, vol. I, in 1958, then reprinted as late as *Pohl'ady do staršej literatúry* (Bratislava: Veda, 1974), 20-25; cited here from 25. The 1974 reprint, however, added Mišianik's grudging caveat on formalist studies; see the footnote on 12.

29. Czech intellectual history and its complexities are beyond the scope of this paper, but it can be said that while Slovaks had to search for identity, the Czech effort was to keep the continuity of their established identity. Thus, Marxism-Leninism was less useful as a tool for understanding Czech history and identity. There exist so many publications on Czech literature that instead of making even summary references, I point to this pervading theme of historical memory in dissident or exile writers and historians. See, for example, Milan Kundera's interview in the *New York Review of Books* on November 30, 1980 or merely the titles of his recent novels, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting* and *The Unbearable Lightness [=fragility] of Being*. Most of the Czech contributions to *Cross Currents*, Vols. 1-4 (1982-1985), involve this theme, as does the recent sampling of Czech historians in English in the double issue of *Kosmas* prepared by H. Gordon Skilling and Vilém Prečan, Vol. III, No. 2 and Vol. IV, No. 1 (1984-1985).

30. Vlček's various histories were reprinted in *Kapitoly zo slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1954) and *Medzi Váhom a Vltavou* (Bratislava: Slov. Vyd. krásnej lit., 1957); Štefan Krčméry, *Sto päťdesiat rokov slovenskej literatúry*, 2 vols. (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1943, rpt. enlarged *Dejiny literatúry slovenskej*, 2 vols. Bratislava: Tatran, 1976). The comparison to Czech literature was especially true of the various histories (1911-55) of Albert Pražák, a Czech-born professor at the University of Bratislava; see bibliography in the literary histories given above. The first periodization of Slovak literature which did not simply

follow the periodization of Czech literature was made by the Polish critic Wladyslav Bobek working in the *Matica slovenská*, "K problému periodizácie slovenských literárnych dejín," *Zborník MS*, 15 (1937), 486-501.

31. Interestingly, a somewhat different situation existed in relation to Magyar history and literature. Besides the long feudal and chauvinist domination of the other nationalities which Magyar Marxists themselves had to condemn, Magyar-language literature showed at least some of the early "high culture" development unknown with Slovak-language literature. Thus there could have been a comparison of Slovak/Magyar literature similar to the comparison of Slovak/Czech literature, though in fact this second comparison was scarcely made. Presumably the difference resulted from the long tradition of resisting a close relation to Magyar culture, according to Ivan Kusý, "Úvod," *Dejiny SAV*, III, 12-13. Doubtless, it also reflects greater Czech than Magyar interest in Slovak literature.

32. Peter Brock has summarized the "Slovak idea of nationality" from the founding period before Bernolák through the Štúr period to 1848, in *The Slovak National Awakening* (University of Toronto Press, 1976). Krčméry's history of literature embodies this view, as does Kirschbaum's work in English.

33. This definition of national literature, still a cornerstone of official Soviet aesthetics, is taken from A. Ye-gorov, "Internationalist, Integral and Multinational Soviet Artistic Culture," in *Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics and Life: A Collection of Articles*, eds. O. Kulikova and A. Zis (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976), 22.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Chodovia*, inhabitants of Chodsko in southwest Bohemia, were traditionally Czech borderguards; the point here is that Slovaks guarded the continent. Reference to themselves as the borderguards of Europe is a commonplace of the Slavic peoples, cf. Czeslaw Milosz's autobiography *Native Realm*, with its French title *Une autre Europe*. Often included, as here, is a tinge of

envy/resentment/fatigue at Western European indifference toward the source of its security and luxury.

36. The title (*Dúchanie do pahrieb*) means "Blowing on the Embers" of Slovak consciousness by Jozef Miloslav Hurban and the other revolutionaries and literary figures of the mid-19th century. The essay was first published in *Slovenské pohľady*, No. 1-4 (1969) and reprinted several times; it is cited here from Mináč's collected essays *Súvislosti* (Bratislava: Slovensky spisovateľ', 1976), page references given in the text. For appreciative reviews by emigré writers, see J. A. Mikuš, Review, *Most*, 18, No. 1-2 (1971), 86-88, and Štefan Polakovič, "Nad Mináčovým Duchaním do pahrieb," *Most*, 23, No. 1-2 (1976), 53-64; for a less favorable view, see Jozef Špetko, "Slovensko v plebejskej košeli?" *Most*, 24, No 1-2 (1977), 36-41.

37. See the references in my "Preliminary Notes on Martin Kukučín's Criticism of Americanized Slovaks," *Slovak Studies*, XVIII (1978), 153-165.

38. The strong moral emphasis of this tradition and its demand for social justice, for measuring goodness by work, calls to mind and seems analogous to the liberation theology of Latin America. Obviously there is the great difference that the latter is a Biblical theology of Christian reform while traditional Marxism (including all Slovak varieties) is atheist and militantly anticlerical. Nevertheless, one can see a common relation to two late-surviving "feudalisms"-- geographically separate but culturally close in their historically Roman Catholic culture and their centuries of extreme economic disparities. Oppression was doubtless much greater in Latin America, but prewar Slovakia was strikingly backward by Central European standards. Both situations allowed effective use of Marxist historical and economic analysis. This is only an analogy, however, as I know of no Slovak references to liberation theology or even any translations of the basic authors (such as Gustavo Gutierrez) by the exile presses that circulate books of contemporary Christian thought. I am unaware of any Slovak corollary to the Czech philosopher Milan Machovec and his *A Marxist Looks at Jesus* (English translation, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976). For a discus-

sion of related parallels between Marxism and Christianity, see Arthur F. McGovern, *Marxism: An American Christian Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1981) and its references.

39. These works were chosen from among many because all but one can be found in English studies or translations: Hugo-lín Gavlovič, *Valaská škola 1755*, ed. G. J. Sabo (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1986); Martin Kukcín, *Seven Slovak Stories*, trans. Norma L. Rudinsky (Rome: Slovak Institute, 1980); Boužena Slančíková Timrava, *An Incipient Feminist: Slovak Stories by Timrava from 1896 to 1926*, trans. Norma L. Rudinsky (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1986); J. C. Hronský, *Jozef Mak*, trans. Andrew Cincura (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1985).

40. Peter Jaroš, *Tisícročná včela* (Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1979). The film was directed by Juraj Jakobisko in 1984.

41. For an English survey of the new prose literature of this period, see Peter Petro, "Modern Slovak Fiction: The Sixties, a Decade of Experimentation," *Slovakia*, XXX (1982-1983), 153-164. On some of the critics and especially literary theorists such as František Miko and Anton Popovič, whose work is related to both Jan Mukařovský and Yuri Lotman, see Edward Mozejko, "Slovak Theory of Literary Communication: Notes on the Nitra School of Literary Criticism," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 4 (1979), 371-384.

42. *Dejiny SAV*.

43. Brock, *National Awakening*, ix-x.

44. Dorothea H. El Mallakh, *The Slovak Autonomy Movement, 1935-1939: A Study in Unrelenting Nationalism* (Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1979).

45. Václav Havel, "Six Asides about Culture," *Kosmos*, 3/4 (1984/1985), 40.